PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

| Application Number | 09/032,863 | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Filing Date | March 02, 1998 Grigor et al. | |
| First Named Inventor | | |
| Group Art Unit | 2674 | |
| Examiner Name | K. Nguyen | |
| Attorney Docket Number | 980044(0100.98.1117) | |

| ENCLOSURES (check all that apply) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Fee Transmittal Form | Assignment Papers (for an Application) | After Allowance Communication to Group | | |
| Fee Attached | Drawing(s) | Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences | | |
| Amendment / Reply | Licensing-related Papers | Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) | | |
| After Final | Petition | Proprietary Information | | |
| Affidavits/declaration(s) | Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application | Status Letter | | |
| Extension of Time Request | Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address | Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): | | |
| Express Abandonment Request | Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund | postcard | | |
| Information Disclosure Statement | CD, Number of CD(s) | En Color | | |
| Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) | Remarks | Olay of the | | |
| Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application | | Cente Top | | |
| Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | | postcard Rechnology Carte Soot | | |
| SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT | | | | |
| Firm Timothy J. Be or Reg. No. 48.1 | chen | | | |
| Signature / w | | | | |
| Date October 15, 20 | 001 | | | |
| CERTIFICATE OF MAILING | | | | |

| | _ |
|---|---|
| I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with <u>sufficient postage as first class</u> mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: October 15, 2001 | |
| | |

Timothy J/Becklen Typed or printed name

Date October 15, 20001 Signature

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

N THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE TO THE Examiner: K. Nguyen

Applicant: Gordon F. Grigor et. al.

Serial No: 09/032,863 Filing Date: 3/02/98

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR CONFIGURING MULTIPLE DISPLAYS

ASSOCIATED WITH A COMPUTING SYSTEM

October 15, 2001

Box AF Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231

Certificate of IST Class Mailing I hereby certify that this paper is sent via 1st class mail addressed to: Box AF Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this date.

REMARKS

This is in response to a final Office Action, Paper No. 17, mailed August 14, 2001. Claims 24, 29-33 and 38-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,874,928 issued to Kou ("Kou") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,559,525 issued to Zenda ("Zenda"). Furthermore, claims 24, 29-33 and 38-55 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,361,078 issued to Caine ("Caine").

Regarding the rejection of claims 24, 29-33 and 38-48 as being unpatentable over Kou in view of Zenda, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants submit that upon closer inspection, it can be seen that the present invention as claimed in claims 24, 29-33 and 38-48 are not obvious in view of the combination of the prior art references.

The Examiner has cited Kou as teaching a video graphics processing circuit, a host computer, a display memory and a frame buffer. Furthermore, the Examiner has indicated Kou teaches a write buffer which is the same buffer as the frame buffer, a read buffer to correspond to the digital storage medium and memory for storing program instructions. The Examiner further indicated that the combination of these elements obviously teaches the claim limitation of "received display preferences regarding at least one of a multiple display as claimed."